



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES AND DISCUSSION.

Analecta I.—English Massorites.—I am not going to overthrow Mr. Jacobs's cleverly constructed mosaic on some pretended English grammarians or Massorites. What I propose to give here is a few facts and data concerning some of them, mentioned by Mr. Jacobs (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, I., pp. 182 and 183). I hope that they will be of some use for clearing up many doubtful points in Mr. Jacobs's notes, and I am sure that he will take my documents into consideration, correct my statements, and bring them into harmony with his own, if possible, or else withdraw his ingenious combinations altogether. I am prepared to learn from him in this matter, and to accept his combinations if the contradictory statement can be explained away by him.

Let us first see what the date of Berechiah the Naqdan can be. It is certain that the author of the Fox Fables, Berechiah ben Natronai, called Crespia, is identical with the translator of the *Quæstiones Naturales* of Adelard of Bath, and the *Lapidarium*. I can agree now with Dr. Stein-schneider that he is also the author of the *Matsref*—although the identity of certain expressions is not always an infallible argument—but probably not of the paraphrase of Saadya Gaon's *Emunoth v' Deoth*. I regret also that I have imputed to him two Berechiyahs, whilst he speaks of two Crespias, one of whom was also called Berechiah (*Isr. Letterbode*, viii., p. 25 *sqq.*). On the other hand, Dr. P. Bloch (*Monatsschrift für Geschichte des Judenthums*, xix., 1870, p. 451) states that the author of the *Matsref*, who made use of the writings of R. Nissim the elder, of Solomon ben Gabirol, of Bahya ben Joseph, and of Abraham ben David, the philosopher, borrows nothing from Maimonides' *Moreh Nebukhim*, the translation of which was certainly current in Provence and France towards 1204. Thus if Berechiah Naqdan were the author of the *Matsref*, which Dr. Bloch does not admit, he must have written it when young, since we shall see that at the date 1250-70 he was called by his son an old man. It might be said that Berechiah was a tacit antagonist of Maimonides, and therefore neglects him; but this can scarcely be the case with the enlightened translator of Adelard's book, and the author of the Fox Fables. We shall now give the two colophons of MSS. by which it is made clear that Berechiah the Naqdan is identical with the author of the Fox Fables and the *Lapidarium*, and that he was in 1250-70 an old man. The first is to be found in the MS. of the Vatican Library (Asseman, No. XIV.), according to my copy, revised by Prof. Ignazio Guidi.

אני אליה איש רב פעלים בן הקרא הרב רבי ברכיה התנא והנקרן והדריון
אשר אין ותker תקן משלים הרבה ובכוזן מבנים אשר נדב לבו לעשות ספר
זה:

"I, Elijah, a man who has done many acts (2 Sam. xxiii. 20), son of the reader, R. Berechiah, the learned, the punctuator and grammarian, who gave good heed, and sought out, and set in order many proverbs (Fables, Eccl. xii. 9). And blessed from sons (Deut. xxxvii. 24), whose heart made him willing (Exodus xxxv. 21) to produce such a beautiful book. May God help him to meditate in it. Amen."

This MS. contains a Pentateuch, with Megilloth and Haftaroth, and the copy was finished Tuesday, the 10th of Ab, 5049=10th of July, 1289.

From the absence of the formula for the dead, which a son would not have omitted, we have a right to conclude that Berechiah the Naqdan and author of the Fables was still alive in 1289. Consequently, if quoted by Moses ben Isaac about 1200, Berechiah must have reached the age of at least 120 years, and this age would not have passed without having been mentioned by chroniclers. But we shall see in the following colophon that Berechiah is named by his son in the year 1333 also without ל'.

In the MS. of Berlin, Or. Qu. 9 (Dr. Steinschneider's Catalogue, p. 22), חוק ואתחזק הסופר לא ייק. אני הסופר והנקדר: we read the following: אלהו בן ה... ר ברכיה הנקרן והקרא והתנא והדריון והחכם גדור ולהיועץ אשר און וחקר תקן מש[לט]ם הרבה. ודבר על העצים והאבנים אבני מחצב איש חם יישר יושר מרע. ואני בן זקנינו כתבי נקדתי ומפרתי זה הספר בזעת אפי. וביניע כפי. וביוישר עפטע. וכיימתי אותו יום ד' באחד עשרים יום לירח מוחשון שנה ציד לפרט אלף הרבייע במדינת רדום כתבתני.... R. Berechiah the Naqdan, the reader, the learned man, the grammarian, the great, wise man, and the counsellor who gave good heed, and sought out, and set in order many proverbs (fables), and he spoke of trees and stones (1 Kings v. 12, A.V., iv. 33), hewn stones, a man perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and eschewed evil (Job i. 1). And I, the son of his *old age*, wrote, pointed and provided with the Massorah this book, in the sweat of my face (Gen. iii. 19), with the labour of my hands (Gen. xxxi. 42), and with the straight look of my eyelids (Prov. iv. 25), and finished it on Wednesday, the 21st of the month Marheshwan, 5094=30th of October, 1333, in the town of Dreux. Blessed, etc."

This colophon is indeed carelessly written, notwithstanding its being Elijah's autograph. We find l. ואתחזק for the usual ; l. והדריון ; ונתהזק for the usual

for בָּן הַחֲמִישֵׁי הַרְבִּיעֵי ; והדריון for הנְדוֹל. In l. after . . . Dr. Steinschneider says that there are only two words missing, which represent an epithet, but not a name, as stated by some bibliographers. The words "son of his age" might mean that Berechiah was an old man in 1333, and in that case he would be born about 1240. Usually "son of his age" means that the child was born in the old age of the father. But if so, why has not Elijah's colophon of 1289 these words ? לדום, which is the correct reading according to Dr. Steinschneider's communication, is a riddle, unless we could read דראס, which represents Dreux in Normandy (Bacher, *Revue des Études Juives*, xvii., p. 300 *sqq.*). This would be of importance for Berechiah's native country; but were there Jews in Normandy in 1333? It is not impossible.

Certain it is that Berechiah of Lincoln is not identical with Berechiah Naqdan (see Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, ix. 1871, p. 231), and that there was only one Berechiah with the epithet of Naqdan. He, in the year 1200, when, according to Mr. Jacobs, the *Shoham* was composed, could not have been more than twenty years of age, but was more probably younger, and not yet important enough to be quoted by a ripe scholar as Moses ben Isaac was, according to Mr. Jacobs.

Let me now mention another date, that is of Samuel the Naqdan. The MS. A. 1 of St. John's College, Cambridge, which contains the Pentateuch, the Megilloth, the Psalms, Job, the Proverbs, and the Haftaroth, was pointed by Samuel Naqdan for his brother, R. Levi, and finished on Friday, Sedrâ נחצן, 5020=August-September, 1260. The characters are Franco-German. Can this Samuel be identical with "Samuel le Pointeur"

in the list of Bristol Jews paying tallage in 1194? Even admitting that there were two Samuel Naqdans, it will always remain doubtful which is quoted by the author of the book *Shoham*; but in the case of two Naqdans with the same name there would be a distinction made by the name of the father, or some other word. Of course the Rabbenu Samuel, the author of the grammatical treatise in a MS. at Berlin (Dr. Steinschneider's Catalogue, p. 101), is most likely Samuel ben Meir of Ramerapt (*Rashbam*). The French words here given by Dr. Steinschneider, טובי נין דאנץ ought to be read נובניין דאנץ, *Novaine dans [cent]*, a ninth of hundred. Perhaps Dr. Rosin, of Breslau, who is an authority on the *Rashbam* literature, will confirm our statement.

Next we have to mention another person in Mr. Jacobs's notice. It seems that Isaac of Russia, who may be the same person mentioned in the Pipe-roll of 27 Henry II., was a pupil of Judah the pious, and a contemporary or co-disciple of Eleazar of Worms; whilst Isaac of Tschernigoff, from whom Moses of England heard that ים means in Russian "co-habitation" (not, as Mr. Jacobs says, "brother-in-law"), is different from Isaac of Russia (see *hak-Karmel*, 1875, pp. 33, 34). It is scarcely to be believed that the explanation of ים would have been given to a boy of 12-15. Neither of these two must be confounded with Isaac, son of Dorbolo, who visited Russia, but whose father was an older contemporary of Rashi (see *Israelitische Letterbode*, viii., (1883), p. 130, extract from the *Agudah*).

There is no difficulty about the date of בָּלְנֶצִי, quoted in the *Shoham*, who is no doubt Eliezer of Beaugency (see, however, Nutt, preface to Eleazar's commentary on Isaiah, London, 1879, p. xxix.), and who was a pupil of Rashbam (died about 1158). On the other hand, it is not proved that Moses, son of Yom Tob, was one of the masters of Moses of England; we should rather take the epithet וּמֹרֵר than as וּמֹרֵר; but is it certain at all that this Moses is the same who is mentioned in the Berlin MS.? Is it even sure that הר"ם in the Berlin MS. is the abridged form of R. M[oses]? It might mean Meir, Menahem, Mordecai, and many other names. לְוַנְדְּרִישׁ is scarcely a corruption of לְוַנְדְּרִיטְשׁ. And, after all, the postscript which states that the book of Punctuation is by R. M., son of Yom Tob is only to be found in the Berlin MS., which is, if we are not mistaken, of the sixteenth century, whilst the MSS. of Munich, p. 53, Parma, p. 396, 2 and 764, 4 of the Catalog De Rossi (Oxford, p. 25, 21, 4. is unfortunately incomplete), have not this name at all. I may be allowed to say a word or two concerning the ספר הנקיין.

In the *Sepher hash-Shoham* the chapters on the punctuation are much shorter than in that published by Frensdorff (which is not complete), and that in MSS. In the *Sepher hash-Shoham* (folio 129b) are the following chapters:—

זה יהיה משפט הקוראים יש לכם לדעת כי הנקוד נון בסיני ולא שנקדדו הלוחות אך כאשר דבר הבורא יש בלשון הקורש הבינו השומעים כל התניות.

2. Agreeing with Parma and Munich, fol. 124.
3. מי יודע ישוב ויראה הלכות גדולות בכל הנקוד. יש לך לדעת כי ראוי כל התורה להנקד תנוועת אַהֲרֹן בקמץ דברי משה וכלה. כל אדרוניות ואלהות מנהג Berlin and Munich, fol. 128.

הוּא בְּלִי תִּיבַּח שָׁפֹוףָ אֵת וְ הַוָּא כְּמוֹ אֲהָן מִפְּרָטִים נִשְׁמַע הַטְּמֻם כִּי בְּלִי מִשְׁקָלְלָה (ibidem. Moses Roti, Samuel Naqdan and Rashi are not quoted in this treatise on punctuation, but they are to be found in the edition, and in the MSS. of Parma; indeed, the first name is only to be found in the Parma MS. n. 396, where we read the following words: מִשְׁהָ רֹטִי נִשְׁמַע הַטְּמֻם כִּי בְּלִי מִשְׁקָלְלָה) פרוּשׁוֹ רְגִילָּדָם לְעֶשֶׂת אֲתָה דָבָר (compare the ed., p. 4, line 8); and for Samuel Naqdan (ed., p. 2, l. 3 from the bottom) we read in the Parma MS. the following words: אֲךָ שְׁמַעְתִּי מִפְּרָטִים נִקְרָן כִּי כֵן, which would imply that the author of the treatise of punctuation was a contemporary of Samuel Naqdan. The statement in the *Histoire littéraire de la France* (T. xxvii., p. 487), that the author of the printed treatise is identical with that of Moses of London, on the ground that in both compositions of the book of Punctuation Samuel Naqdan and Moses Roti are quoted, is not quite correct, as we have seen. The identification rests on the quotations of these authors in the book *Shoham* (in the Lexicographical part), which are the same as in book of Punctuation in the MS. of Parma. Before continuing, I may be permitted to state that the Berlin MS. (Catalogue of Steinschneider, p. 54, 2) agrees completely with the Parma MS. 396, except for the passage beginning יְהִי רְמִזְבֵּחַ, and the other beginning סְלִיק (see above p. 323). Now, that the book of Punctuation published by Frensdorff, and that found in the MSS. mentioned above, are by an author called Moses is certain from the words אָמַר מֹשֶׁה, "Moses says," in the MS. Parma, p. 396, whilst, in the MS. of the Bodleian, we read מֹשֶׁה הַכֹּהֵן, "Moses hak-Kohen;" we suppose the MSS. at Berlin and Munich have no name at all, since none is given by Dr. Steinschneider. Which Moses is the author of the book of Punctuation becomes doubtful from the quotations we have just given. Perhaps the name in the Berlin MS., יְמִינְמָן טָבָבָר, is a corruption of רְמִזְבֵּחַ רְמִזְבֵּחַ (רְמִזְבֵּחַ & רְמִזְבֵּחַ), made by the copyist of the sixteenth century; or it is possible that Moses ben Yom Tob enlarged the treatise of Moses ben Isaac, his contemporary but not his pupil. For the author of the book *Shoham*, if he had abridged from his master's book, would have acknowledged it. Certain it is that the contents and the methods of the treating of punctuation in the *Sepher hash-Shoham* and in the edition of Frensdorff are similar to such a degree that the latter might be considered as a second composition of the former, as suggested in the *Histoire Littéraire*. Let me also mention here that it is scarcely David Qamhi who is quoted by the author of the *Shoham* by the words קָמְחִי or בֶן קָמְחִי, as said in the *Histoire Littéraire*, but most likely Joseph Qamhi. It seems that the author of the book of the Onyx did not know the dictionary of David Qamhi, at least he does not mention it, though he had the opportunity of doing so when he complains about the incompleteness of S. Pirbon's dictionary. This would rather be an argument that Moses, son of Isaac, wrote before David Qamhi's dictionary became known, about 1210-1220. But neither does he mention the grammar and lexicon of R. Jonah, both translated by Judah ibn Tibbon, nor the refutations of Jacob Tam, which he must have known from Joseph Qamhi's *ספר הנלוי* (ably edited by Mr. H. J. Mathews, of Exeter College, Oxford), which he quotes.

Mr. Jacobs has found an Isaac, the son of Comitisse, married before 1168, and making him the father of Moses, the author of the *Shoham*, says that he was born in that year. Mr. Jacobs further proceeds to find the tombstone of Moses, who died before 1215, and on which we read the simple inscription, מִצְבָּת[ת] רְמִזְבֵּחַ מִשְׁהָ בֶן הַרְבֵּבֶץ. If Mr. Jacobs is right in his conclusions, Moses died at the com-

paratively early age of forty-five, being then already a celebrated grammarian; we should expect, in that case, some higher title than the simple 'בָּנֶה'. It seems, moreover, that Moses ben Isaac did not live in England at all, but only sprang from an English family, for he calls himself "Moses, son of Isaac, who is known as the son of the Comitissa who comes from the land England" (הַדּוֹעַ בְּן הַנְּשָׂאָה אֲשָׁר) (מדרי נאדיין אינגלטירא; had Moses, or even his father Isaac, been living in England, Moses would have said Comitissa of London, or Lincoln, or Cambridge, according to her residence. "Of England" is analogous to the expressions מִכְרִינָה אֲשָׁכָנָן, צְרָפָת, סְפָרָה, which point to the origin of the family, but not the actual dwelling-place of the writer.

To resume my statements. Berechiah Naqdan seems to have composed his Fables before 1299, but not yet the *Quæstiones* and the *Lapidarium* which his son does not mention at that date. Berechiah, Moses son of Isaac, Samuel Naqdan, Isaac of Tschernigoff, seem to have been contemporaries, most likely in the middle of the fourteenth century. Consequently Benedict Crispi in 1193 cannot be identical with our Berechiah. Identifications which are based on the similarity of names are not justified at all if there is no other reliable ground for them. Ibn Ezra, in his introduction to the *Yesod Mora*, written in 1158, could not have alluded to an English massoretic school, for the simple reason that there was none, at that time at least. Moses ben Isaac and ben Yom Tob were in that year not yet born, and Moses ben Isaac, if he had composed his work in England, would not have omitted to mention English Massorites before and during his own time. He quotes French authorities mostly, and Ibn Ezra alluded, most likely, to the same school, where we find Rabbenu Gershom, Jacob of Ramerupt, and others who copied Bibles according to the Massorah, and even a Massorah (Dr. Graetz thinks, that R. Gershom was the author of one Massorah, see *Monatsschrift*, etc., 1887, p. 30). Besides, Ibn Ezra wrote his book on his arrival in London after a lengthened sojourn at Dreux. Perhaps the commentary on Job (MS. Cambridge, No. 28 of the first volume of Dr. Schiller-Szinessy's catalogue, 1876, see also p. 245 of the same work), which is considered to be by a R. Berechiah, and perhaps by our Naqdan, may give some clue to our questions. It was stated in 1876 that the MS. had been transcribed, and was being prepared for publication by Mr. W. Aldis Wright, of Trinity College, Cambridge. We are now at the end of 1889, and there is no trace yet of this publication. I think it, therefore, right to give the following extracts, which may possibly lead to the discovery of the author of this commentary. There are many extracts from Eliezer of Beaugency (see the above-mentioned catalogue, p. 41;

שםית ר' אליעזר, folio 2 a., מבצעי צי, והנכון כמו שפ' (b) 14b, and Ibn Ezra. The quotations from the author's father are the following: Job x. 7 (folio 6b) — אָבִי זִצְלָ פִי, פָּרֵד הַרְגִּיל, (b) 4 (fol. 7a) — אָבִי זִצְלָ עַם דָּעַתְךָ בַּי לְאָדָשָׁתִי נְגַל יְבוֹל. וְהָא נְגַל וּמוֹצָא לְאַחֲרִים, (fol. 11b) 28 — בָּזָה בְּסֶפֶר שְׁהָוָא עֲנֵיִן יְנוּן—וְאָא בְּתִרְגּוּמוֹ לְקוֹשֶׁת קַש שְׁהָוָא נִילָה כִּי כָל יְבוֹלָו יְהִיה קָשׁ וּכְאָעָם אָמִי אָבִי זִיל בְּצָאתִי שָׁעַד שְׁהָוָא מִצְיאָתִי לְבָדָה, לִיד, (b) 15b, 7. (fol. 15b) xxix. There is another quotation which may help us to recognise the author of the commentary, viz. from his uncle Benjamin. He says, fol. 8b (xiii. 27) על שְׁרֵשִׁי רְגִיל the following: יְדוּיִ ר' בְּנִימָן אוּ אֶל שְׁרָשּׁוֹת שְׁשָׁמַת בְּרָגִיל הַעֲשָׂה חִוּתָם וְזֹהוּ תַּתְחָקָה :

זהוּ אַבְנִימָן הַעֲלֵה וְקַשׁ הַבִּבְשָׁס. Who this Binjamin was cannot be said off-hand ; he was possibly identical with the Binjamin who made annotations to Joseph Qamhi's *ס' הנלו'* (see Mr. Mathews' preface), in defence of R. Jacob Tam, of Ramerupt, against whom J. Qamhi's book is directed ; Binjamin, as Mr. Mathews rightly says, was probably a French Jew. It is possible that our Binjamin is Benjamin of Canterbury, who is quoted by the glossators. This was suggested to Mr. Mathews (communication of the 17th December, 1889) by Herr Emanuel Blüth, cand. Philos. at Tübingen ; Mr. Mathews rightly adds, "as Benjamin of Canterbury was a pupil of Rab Tam, I think it quite possible."

POSTSCRIPT.—The preceding article was already in type when I received Mr. Jacobs' admirable preface to his edition of the "Fables of Aesop" (see JEWISH QUARTERLY, Vol. II., p. 182), in which he naturally has to speak of one Berechiah as the author or translator of the fables "about the fox." After having ingeniously identified the King Alfred of Marie de France with Alfred the Englishman, who, according to Roger Bacon, translated from the Arabic, Mr. Jacobs says he "can show that Berechiah assisted Alfred as the Jew Andreas assisted Michael Scott." Of course Bacon does not say expressly that Alfred had Jewish help for his translations from the Arabic, but the following sentences may possibly imply it. Bacon says (*Compendium Studii*, ed. Brewer, p. 471) as follows : "Unde cum per Gerardum Cremonensem, et Michaelem Scotum, et Aluredum Anglicum, et Heremannum Alemannum, et Willielmum Flemingum, data sit notis copia translationum de omni scientia, accidit tanta falsitas in eorum operibus, quod nullus sufficit admirari. Nam ad hoc quod translatio fiat vera, oportet quod translator sciat linguam a qua transfert, et linguam in quam transfert, et scientiam quam vult transferre. Sed quis est hic, et laudabimus eum ? . . . Similiter Michael Scotus ascripsit sibi translationes multas. Sed certum est quod Andreas quidam Judæus, plus laboravit in his. Unde Michaelus, sicut Heremannus retulit, nec scivit scientias neque linguas. Et sic de aliis. (For Andreas, see *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, t. xxvii., page 583.)

If so, Berechiah was at work as Dragoman to Alfred about 1200, and consequently he knew Arabic. Where he acquired the knowledge of this language to such a perfection as is necessary for translating a text written in rhymed prose (for Mr. Jacobs presumes that Berechiah imitated his Hebrew in rhymed prose from an Arabic original), Mr. Jacobs does not say. Alfred and Michael Scott had opportunities of learning Arabic in Spain and Sicily, or in convents, where monks from all countries were to be found. Berechiah had no such opportunity, for nothing is known about his visiting Arabic speaking countries ; from Ibn Ezra he could not have learned it as early as 1158—besides, Ibn Ezra was not a great Arabic scholar—and much less from monks. In Champagne, in Paris, and in Normandy, the Rabbis did not know Arabic. It is true that Moses fils Isaac of England shows in his grammatical work some knowledge of Arabic grammar, the terms of which he uses in his *hash-Shoham*, but according to our opinion he acquired it in Provence, where he was most likely educated. If Moses was a contemporary of Berechiah, as Mr

Jacobs believes, he will have to tell us whence Moses derived his knowledge of Arabic. The style in rhymed prose is not a direct imitation or a translation from the Arabic, as far as the east of France and Normandy are concerned, but an imitation of Kalir and other liturgists, as well as of the school of Menahem-Dunash, Joseph Qamhi and others. Jacob of Ramrupt employs the same style in his *Hakharoth* without any knowledge of Arabic.

Mr. Jacobs now gives up the identification of Berechiah with Benedict Crispi of Canterbury (see above, p. 326), and this weakens his supposed Massoretic school of this town; he identifies him with "Benedictus the puncteur of Oxford," who paid a contribution to Richard I. on his return to (*sic*) captivity, as found in an unpublished document in the Record Office. Thus Mr. Jacobs assumes "that Berechiah lived in England about 1190 A.D., and was known among Englishmen as Benedict the puncteur." "If so, we can," Mr. Jacobs says, "scarcely imagine the two men, Alfred and Benedict, translating from the Arabic independently, and it is but the slightest step further to assume that Benedict (Berechiah) the Jew was to Alfred the Englishman what Andrew the Jew was to Michael Scott." Before I proceed with my comments, I shall give the Latin text concerning Benedict and Samuel from the document marked Exchequer Q. R. Jews, $\frac{5}{2}^6$, which I have obtained through the kindness of Mr. Black of the Record Office. The following is the heading of the document:—

"Recepta denariorum facta apud Westm' de promisso Judæorum totius Anglie facto apud Norttampton post redditum Domini Regis de Alemania (not when Richard returned to captivity, but *from* captivity) intermissa in termino pasche anni quinti ejusdem, etc., de m.m.m.m. mille marcis."

Under Oxonia there is mentioned amongst other names the following : "De Benedicto le pointur xxvi. s. et viii. d. pro eodem."

In another part of this document we find, according to Mr. C. Crump of the Record Office, the following mention "Bristow per manum de Bucking Samuel le pointur, xxx. s. iiiij. d." In the word "pointur," the letters *p*, *o*, *t*, *u*, and *r* are certain according to the authority of Mr. Crump, the *i* and *n* in "pointur" form in the document, according to Mr. Crump, "three minimis" which may be *ui*, *ni*, *m*, and *in*, and only the last combination gives a sense. Consequently the reading of "pointur" may be taken as the right one. Mr. Jacob, who reads *punctr*, takes the word as a translation of *Naqdan*, "who puts the vowel points," and accordingly Benedict and Samuel the pointur are identical with Berechiah and Samuel the Naqdan. We have seen (above, page 323) that a Samuel Naqdan lived in the middle of the thirteenth century, and that two Samuel Naqdans would have been distinguished by late writers. Is it certain that "pointur" means what Mr. Jacobs assumes? This epithet "pointeur" means according to M. Godefroy (*Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*, etc., Paris, 1881, letter P, page 255a), "Officier publique, chargé d'imposer les taxes et les impôts." And if I am right in my reading of the Shtar No. 136) in Mr. Davis' *Hebrew Deeds*, etc. (page 278), such a functionary existed amongst the Jews, of which the Hebrew name is נוקד. I read line 12 of this Shtar [נ משה] הלבן והודיעי י"ש [נוקדים] אם קבלת שום דבר מן המם. And even if it could be admitted that "pointur" is a translation of Naqdan, it is doubtful whether in his youth Berechiah had already acquired the epithet of Naqdan. According to M. Godefroy (*op. cit.*, P. page 62b.) "pointeur" might also mean a painter; but the Jews scarcely exercised this profession, which is contrary to the Rabbinical law.

On no surer basis stands the argument concerning "a tradition that Oxford Jews helped towards the foundation of the University of this town." Mr. Jacobs does not give his source for this tradition; if it is derived from Anthony Wood, it has certainly no solid basis (see *Notes on Oxford Jews*, in the *Collectanea II.*, published by the Oxford Historical Society, p. 286 *sqq.*). I raise another question, viz., Is it really certain that Alfred made his translations in England? Michael Scott made his elsewhere. When Mr. Jacobs adduces as an argument for Berechiah's English nationality and his early date that his other translation is the work of an Englishman of the twelfth century, *The Quæstiones Naturales*, of Adelard of Bath, he forgets that he also translated the *Lapidarium* from the French, and that the translators of Avicenna, for instance, were not of the town of Rai, and not contemporaries of his. Kalonymos of Arles and Avignon was neither a countryman of Averroes nor his contemporary. Mr. Jacobs also adduces as an argument for his thesis that "the authorities Berachiah chiefly quotes, Abraham Ibn Ezra and Solomon Parchon (rather Pirhon), are those generally quoted by English Jews." Generally? There exists one work only, and that by the supposed Englishman, *i.e.*, the book of Moses, son of Isaac (see above, page 325), in his *Hash-Shoham*, where the author quotes many more authorities than the two mentioned. It is true that the translator of the *Image du Monde* also quotes Abraham Ibn Ezra, but Mr. Jacobs does not accept Hagin as the translator of it (see *Papers read at the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, 1888, p. 47). A further statement of Mr. Jacobs to the effect that England was the seat of a School of Punctuators of the twelfth century, I have tried to refute above (page 326). I am amazed at another argument of Mr. Jacobs, which is the following: he says, "Berachiah sometimes uses French, the ordinary language of the English Jews at this period and later, and London was the chief centre of the French-speaking world under the Angevin kings." What then was the language in Normandy, Paris, and the Champagne? Not French, with Rashi's 2,500 French glosses for the Bible and the Talmud, which glosses were continued in a modified form by the *Tosafists*, and finally put in the shape of vocabularies (see *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, t. xxvii., pp. 488 *sqq.*). The same language is used by Nathan, the Official of Chinon, in controversies with the clergy, whilst a number of French words are to be found in the works of Moses of Coucy and Isaac of Corbeil. But the next argument is certainly the weakest. Here Mr. Jacobs says that "because a MS. which is seemingly the oldest manuscript of the fables (this is not proved at all) once belonged to Cotton, it is probably one of the few Hebrew MSS. belonging to the early Jews of England which have never left England." Many a thing is probable, but for history we want well-founded arguments and not probabilities. To me it seems that Berechiah and Moses son of Isaac were contemporaries, and lived about 1240 in France, and perhaps for some time in Provence. Here Berechiah perhaps acquired the capacity for writing good and pure Hebrew in prose and in rhymed prose, and Moses his grammatical knowledge, based upon the principle of Arabic grammarians. Berechiah's free adaptation of *The Fox Fables* seems to me based upon Marie de France or else on a Provençal text. If, sooner or later, documents should be discovered in favour of Dr. Steinschneider's opinion, which I follow, Mr. Jacobs's preface will nevertheless remain one of the best expositions of the migration of Æsop's Fables.

Speaking of supposed Anglo-Jewish learned men, I may be allowed to give an extract from the Paris-Hebrew MS. No. 4543, which is described in the Catalogue of 1866 as follows: "*Fragments des Tosaphots et de*

divers Commentaires sur le Talmud." On the fly-leaf of this MS. we read : **לְקוֹתּוֹת מַחְדוֹשִׁין עַל קָצֶת הַלְכָה בְּבָא מַצְיעָא וַיְמָוֹת וַחֲדוֹשִׁי נְטִין**. Jacob Etlinger, in his *Novellae* on *Yebamoth* (Altona, 1850), entitled, **עֲרֻךְ לֵר**, refers to the Paris MS., according to a MS. note of the late Dr. Zunz, found by Mr. Schechter. Here we twice see the name of **נוֹרְנִישׁ**, and not **נוֹרְנִיֶּשׁ**, "Norwich," and I repeat that there were no *Tosaphoth* of Norwich, and that no wise men of this town are mentioned in *Commentaries on the Talmud*, except R. Elijah of England, who may be identical with the Poet of Norwich.

A. NEUBAUER.

By the kindness of the editors I have been enabled to see the foregoing reply of Dr. Neubauer to some suggestions of mine, and by a still further extension of their courtesy append my rejoinder to his demurrer without waiting for the lapse of three months. The facts in dispute are these : There is an important Hebrew grammar and dictionary named *The Onyx Book* (ס' השהט) written by "Moses ben Isaac known as the son of Hanassiah who is of the land England" (why does Dr. Neubauer insert "comes"?). The author quotes, among others, Joseph Kimchi, Solomon Parchon, Eliezer of Beaugency, Moses ben Yomtob, Isaac of Tchernigof, Samuel Nakdan, Berachyah Nakdan (I venture to use the old-fashioned spelling of these names). Now of these authorities we know for certain the dates of the first four, that they are all of the latter end of the twelfth century, nor does Moses quote any authority known to be of later date. That is by itself a presumption that the last three writers are also of the end of the twelfth century, and accordingly I was enabled to identify them with Jews mentioned in the English records just about that date, and also produced evidence of an Isaac son of Comitissa (which Dr. Neubauer has accepted as a suitable "Christian" name for Hanassiah) being married in Lincoln in the middle of the twelfth century : he would be the father of R. Moses ben Isaac. All this hangs together, and I cannot see anything in what Dr. Neubauer produces which shakes its consistency. In fact, much that he brings forward, with his usual thoroughness and fairness, is only confirmatory of my position. Thus he grants that it is strange that Moses does not know of David Kimchi's dictionary, known about 1210-20, which he would have naturally referred to when speaking of Solomon Parchon's. Again, he allows that it is strange Berachyah never uses the *Moreh* of Maimonides, known in N. Europe about 1204. And finally he adopts Mr. Mathews' suggestion that Berachyah was a nephew of R. Benjamin of Canterbury, whose *floruit* is 1170 A.D. All these facts agree with my dating, and conflict with Dr. Neubauer's curious view that Moses of England's book was written in Provence about 1240, a view for which he does not bring forward any evidence beyond the fact that Moses knew some Arabic.

There are really only two points in Dr. Neubauer's long excursus which seem to me to bear at all adversely on the suggestions I have made : (1.) Isaac of Tchernigof quoted by Moses ben Isaac is different from the Isaac of Russia, whom I discovered in England, mentioned in the Pipe Roll of 1180 (see my letter in the *Academy*, Jan. 12, 1889). So

says Dr. Neubauer, and refers us to the Hebrew journal *Carmel* for 1875. The said journal is not accessible to me, nor probably to anyone except a few librarians in Europe ; and until Dr. Neubauer tells us what is contained there, I for one shall doubt that two different Jews coming all the way from Russia to England bore the same name Isaac.

(2.) The two colophons written by Berachyah's son, Elijah, appear at first sight to date *Elijah* towards the latter end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century. I was, of course, acquainted with the substance of these as given by Dr. Steinschneider, *Heb. Bibl.*, xiii. 83, but all they implied was that Elijah in 1289 was a professional scribe, and was, therefore, at least thirty years old, and was born somewhere between 1230 and 1260, when his father was an old man. Berachyah was, therefore, born between 1160 and 1200 according to the colophon. This was somewhat later than I assumed, but the earlier date 1160 would suit well enough with all my other evidence. But the other colophon as given by Dr. Neubauer is evidently incorrect somewhere, for the year is given as 4094 (= 333 A.D.). Dr. Neubauer assumes that the thousand is given incorrectly : I think it much more likely that the hundred has simply been omitted, and that the correct date is 4994 (= 1233 A.D.). This simple explanation resolves all Dr. Neubauer's difficulties, and, besides, agrees with history. At that date there were Jews in Dreux in Normandy, where Elijah states he was writing, but not in 1333, as all Jews had been expelled from France in 1301.

There remains only Dr. Neubauer's point about the omission of the formula for the dead, י'ל, in the colophons of 1289 and 1333, which would imply, according to him, that Berachyah was living in 1289, and was, therefore, at least 120 years old, if my identification of him was justified. But it would also imply the same for 1333, when Berachyah would also be above that age, even on Dr. Neubauer's hypothesis. For the earliest age which Elijah could have been in 1289 would be 25, and his father must have been at least 60 when Elijah was born as "the son of his old age," and, therefore, Berachyah was 85 in 1289 and 128 in 1333. Q. E. D. The truth is, that the formula is frequently omitted, as Dr. Neubauer must know better than most men. On the same grounds at any rate I can show that Berachyah wrote his נירצ' before 1180 (as is indeed probable enough) ; for in it he quotes Abraham ben David, who was martyred in 1180 (see Steinschneider, *l.c.*), without adding the formula even in the case of a martyr. Besides, it is likely enough that Berachyah was still living in 1233, when one of the colophons was most probably composed, as we have seen.

(3.) Against these two points Dr. Neubauer fails to perceive the significance of the date of Moses ben Yomtob. There can be no doubt of his being an English Jew, as his son Elyas was the great Elyas Pontifex Judæorum (of whom I have spoken, *Papers Anglo-Jewish Exhibition*, pp. 49-51, *Revue des Études Juives*, 1889, p. 260), and he quotes a Response of his father Moses ben Yomtob of London (*Berliner, Heb. Ged. Meir aus Norwich*, p. 6). Now Elyas was appointed Episcopus in 1237, and must have been at least forty at that date. This would fix Moses ben Yomtob's birth about 1160-70. Moses ben Isaac Hanassiah, the author of the *Onyx Book*, quotes him as his teacher (p. 37, ed. Collins), and I leave Dr. Neubauer to explain how this could have been if Moses ben Isaac wrote his *Onyx Book* in Provence about 1240.

Now for some minor points which are introduced by Dr. Neubauer in such number that it is often difficult to see the bearing of them on the general question.

(a.) Dr. Neubauer wants to know where Moses ben Isaac and Berachyah learnt their Arabic from if they lived in England. Why not from Mosse de Hyspan, a Spanish Jew mentioned as being in London 1186-94 (see my *Was Sir Leon ever in London?* p. 2). In retort I could ask, Where did Berachyah get his fables from if not in England? for Dr. Neubauer's suggestion that they are derived from Marie could easily be disproved, and there is no evidence for assuming, as he assumes, that there was a Provençal translation of Marie. The fact that Marie has some fables (about half) in common with Berachyah is easily to be understood if Alfred and Berachyah worked together. That Alfred's *Aesop* was known in England is proved by the Middle English translation. That Alfred himself was in England is proved by his dedicating one of his translations from the Arabic to Roger de Hereford.

(b.) I quoted quite correctly Samuel le Pointeur in THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, p. 183, and I also quote quite correctly Benedictus le Punct^r in my *Aesop*. Dr. Neubauer confuses the two. His "Benedicto le pointur" is wrong. It should be "Bñdicto le punct^r," as in my *Aesop*, and in the MS., which I have again consulted. Dr. Neubauer scarcely appreciates the force of the circumstantial evidence on this point. Moses ben Isaac of England quotes two men as Nakdanim: Samuel and Berachyah. The list of all the most important Jews of England in 1194 (which I am about to publish in the *Revue des Études Juives*) gives only two men as "pointur" or "punct^r," and these are Samuel and Benedictus. Permit me to add from my knowledge of the English records that there is absolutely no evidence of an official named "le pointur" in the English Jewry.

(c.) I fail to understand Dr. Neubauer's amazement about my argument from Berachyah's French words. They prove he was not a Spanish, Italian or German Jew, and, indeed, I should not be surprised if they proved he was not a Provençal Jew, as Dr. Neubauer assumes without the slightest attempt to find any such references in Provençal records or Jewish literature as I have given for my identifications. The French words in Berachyah do not prove he was not an English Jew, for there is plenty of evidence to show that the Jews of England habitually used French even down to the time of their expulsion.

(d.) As regards certain subsidiary points, I only gave them as confirmatory presumptions, and Dr. Neubauer ingeniously tries to leave the impression that these were my strongest points. Thus I stated that there was a tradition about Jews helping to found Oxford University by their learning : Benedict of Oxford (= Berachyah Nakdan) would be a case in point. Dr. Neubauer is, he tells us, going to perform that difficult logical feat of proving a negative, and will show that there is nothing in the tradition. I can quite understand Dr. Neubauer thinking slightly of traditions ; but I have found by experience that a tradition rarely arises without some foundation. Similarly Dr. Neubauer does not see much in my argument from Adelard of Bath. But surely there is some presumption that persons do not select for translation works written by a foreigner two hundred years old. To adopt Dr. Neubauer's tactics, I might ask him how he knows that Adelard of Bath's *Quæstiones Naturales* were known in Provence in 1240. However, these are minor points, some of the might-have-beens against which Dr. Neubauer protests so strongly, but of which he himself makes such large use. The Onyx book *might have been* written in Provence. R. M. ben Yomtob of Lontres *may be* R. Moses Roti. Isaac de Russie *may be* another R. Isaac from Russia. R. Moses ben Isaac of England *may be* R. Moses away from England ; his father Isaac fil Comitissa *may not be* Isaac ben

Hanassiah, and so on. All this might be, but there is nothing in what Dr. Neubauer brings forward that obliges us to make these forced assumptions instead of taking the straightforward facts of the case, as they come out in the records and in Jewish literature. Indeed I fail to see why Dr. Neubauer refuses to accept such simple and obvious identifications which chime in with all the facts of the case and do not require us to assume that documents are wrong—a very dangerous assumption which only Dr. Neubauer's long familiarity with Hebrew MSS. excuses him for making.

Altogether, in order to sustain his objections to my very obvious identifications, Dr. Neubauer has to assume an age of 130 for Berachyah in 1333, has to slice Isaac of Russia into two, has to deny the English domicile of Moses ben Isaac against all authorities, including himself in the *Histoire Littéraire*, has to assume that Elijah wrote *four* when he meant *five*, and that he was living in Normandy in 1333 when no Jews were in France, has to assume without any evidence that the *Aesop* of Alfred was known in Provence, has to attribute an utterly unknown work to the Rashbam, has to transform Moses of Lontres into Moses Roti, has to assume that a writer of the fourteenth century never quotes any authority who is known to have written later than 1210—and all for what? Simply, to leave us still more in the dark than before, with Jewish writers using French words when there were no French Jews, and with writings that find no natural place in the history of Jewish or of mediæval literature. I still, therefore, remain of the opinion that when we find an English Jew, who is ignorant of all Jewish literature after 1210, quoting Samuel the Punctuator, Isaac of Tchernigof and Berachyah the Punctuator, it is not too hazardous to identify these with Jews residing in England at the end of the twelfth century and known as "Samuel le Pointur," "Isaac de Russie," and "Benedict le Puncteur."

JOSEPH JACOBS.

A New Volume of the Work entitled תלמוד תורה.—I published some years ago (*Revue des Études Juives*, t. xiii. page 229 sqq.) extracts from the Agadic collection of Jacob, son of Hananel et Sikeli (of Sicily), on Leviticus, concerning the Midrash *Yelamdenu* from the unique MS. in the library of Baron de Günzburg of St. Petersburg (Cod. 512). The Bodleian Library has recently acquired a MS. which contains the collection of the same author on Numbers and Deuteronomy, which, like that on Leviticus, consists of extracts from the *Agudah* in the Talmud and the *Midrashim*. This work is mentioned in a Yemen Midrash composed between the years 1484 and 1492. (See the Catalogue of the Bodleian Library, No. 2493.) It is there said that Jacob went from Damascus to Aden; indeed, we find in the colophon of our MS. that he finished his work Thursday, the sixth of the month Tishri, 5093 = 1332.

Our MS. may, therefore, prove of interest for the edition of the great Midrash of Yemen, which Mr. Schechter is preparing for publication. I abstain, therefore, from giving Agadic extracts from it, leaving this to Mr. Schechter, who is more experienced in this matter than I am. I